

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to FIG. 1 as well as other changes to improve the quality in order to permit adequate reproduction. These sheets, which include FIGs. 1-13, replace the original sheets including FIGs. 1-13. In Figure 1, previously omitted reference numeral 128 has been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets 1-13

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

1. In the reply filed on August 16, 2004, Applicants elected to prosecute claims 1-30, and provisionally elected to prosecute the claims relating to the embodiment shown in FIG. 11 if no generic claim is found to be allowable.
2. The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 9-11, 14, 16, and 18, but indicated that claims 8 and 17 contain allowable subject matter.

The subject patent application describes various types of linear accelerometers (e.g., FIGs. 1 and 11) in which the movable mass is supported from within its interior by support structures that are anchored to the substrate near the center of mass using one or more anchors. As discussed in the application, such an arrangement of anchors helps to reduce sensitivity of offset to stresses.

Zerbini discloses both a linear accelerometer (FIG. 4) and an angular accelerometer (FIG. 1). Zerbini's angular accelerometer has a mass that is supported by radial support structures, like spokes of a wheel (although they do not meet at a center hub, probably because the tethers would then be too weak to hold up the mass). This arrangement of support structures makes sense for the angular accelerometer, since the mass is supported in such a way that it can rotate about a central axis. On the other hand, Zerbini's linear accelerometer has a mass that is supported by support structures placed external to the mass. In this respect, Zerbini's linear accelerometer is of the type discussed in the background section of the subject patent application. Applicants note that Zerbini's linear accelerometer does not have a movable mass supported from within its interior, as it clearly is not obvious to have such interior supports for a linear accelerometer. The present invention as claimed uses such interior supports to help reduce sensitivity of offset to stresses. Zerbini does not deal at all with offset performance, and it is even possible that the arrangement of

support structures in Zerbini's angular accelerometer may actual make the angular accelerometer more susceptible to offset (although we cannot prove this with information currently available). Thus, Zerbini neither teaches nor suggests a linear accelerometer in which the movable mass is supported from within its interior by support structures that are anchored to the substrate near the center of mass using one or more anchors.

Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to be directed toward linear accelerometers in which the mass support structures allow movement of the mass relative to the substrate along at least one linear axis. Applicants respectfully submit that such linear accelerometers are not anticipated by Zerbini and the other references of record. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 10 are allowable over Zerbini and the other references of record.

3. The Examiner objected to claims 9 and 18 as being indefinite.

Claims 9, 18, and 28 have been canceled.

4. The Examiner objected to the drawings because they were not of sufficient quality to permit adequate reproduction. The Examiner also objected to the drawings for lacking reference numeral 128.

FIG. 1 has been amended to include previously omitted reference numeral 128. The quality of all figures has been improved in order to permit adequate reproduction.

5. The Examiner objected to the specification because the material on page 9, line 1 through page 4, line 14 appeared to be directed to a summary of the invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that the material on page 9, line 1 through page 4, line 14 is part of the detailed description of the invention and therefore belongs in the detailed description section of the application. That material

provides an initial disclosure and overview of various aspects of the invention that are subsequently described in greater detail with reference to exemplary embodiments of the invention. Applicants wish to point out that the application is not required to include a summary of the invention (see 37 CFR 1.73), and so it is appropriate for this material to be in the detailed description section of the application.

6. All pending claims are believed to be in a form suitable for allowance. Therefore, the application is believed to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully requests early allowance of the application. The Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned, Jeffrey T. Klayman, if it will assist further examination of this application.

7. The applicants do not believe any extension of time is required for timely consideration of this response. In the event that an extension has been overlooked, this conditional petition of extension is hereby submitted, and Applicants request that deposit account number 19-4972 be charged for any fees that may be required for the timely consideration of this application.

Date: December 3, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey T. Klayman  
Registration No. 39,250  
Attorney for Applicants

Bromberg & Sunstein LLP  
125 Summer Street  
Boston, Massachusetts 02110-1618  
Tel: (617) 443-9292  
Fax: (617) 443-0004

02550/00168 348527.1